

reidentified all available material of the region. This is true also for all specimens from Mauritius that I have seen and especially for all specimens of the reference collection kept at the Mauritius Institute (Port Louis, Mauritius). If *Cardisoma hirtipes* Dana, 1852, occurred at Mauritius, it would surely be represented at least in this last collection.

3. As the locality is part of Lamarck's description, it seems highly undesirable to me to pass over this exact indication. Following Dr Holthuis' suggestions would result in eliminating this only restricting part of the original description. In my opinion, however, an original type locality should be regarded as sure, unless the contrary may be proved by the exact description or type material.

4. For the selection of a neotype it is obligatory to prove that the locality of the specimen indicated for this purpose is near to the locality of the original type material. (Art. 75c, 4). The nearest possible localities will of course be the Andaman and Nicobar Islands. This solution is in my opinion unsatisfactory as I see no possibility of preference for any locality within the range of *Cardisoma hirtipes* Dana, 1852. All possible localities are too far away.

5. Under the present circumstances I see no chance for *Gecarcinus hirtipes* Lamarck, 1818 being identical with *Cardisoma hirtipes* Dana, 1852. The consequences of substituting *G. hirtipes* Lamarck, 1818, for *C. rotundum* (Quoy & Gaimard, 1824) or identifying it with *C. carnifex* (Herbst, 1796) have been shown in my original application (*Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 32, pp. 168-170).

6. For these reasons I continue to ask the commission for suppression of *Gecarcinus hirtipes* Lamarck, 1818, for all purposes.

#### MORPHIDAE (INSECTA, LEPIDOPTERA), A FURTHER CORRECTION. Z.N.(S)2201

By C.F. Cowan (4, Thornfield Terrace, Grange-over-Sands, Cumbria,  
LA11 7DR, England)

In *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 34(2), pp. 109-111, I requested that Family-Group Name Number 225 on the Official List be changed from MORPHIDAE Westwood, [1851] to MORPHIDAE Boisduval, 1836.

2. Dr Gerardo Lamas of Peru has alerted me to an even earlier proposal of this name, which I must apologise for having completely overlooked.

3. Newman, E., Attempted Division of British Insects into natural Orders (*Ent. Mag.* vol. 2(4) (Oct. 1834), pp. 379-430) covered all insects, including some exotics. Among the latter was "MORPHITES" (pp. 379, 381), which, although given neither a diagnosis nor any included genera, was clearly based on the already universally recognised generic name *Morpho* Fabricius, 1807 [misprinted '1808' in the earlier application]. This proposal appears perfectly valid and acceptable.

4. I therefore request that paragraph 8 of my application referred to in line 1 above be cancelled, and that the International Commission take instead the following action:—

- (1) substitute in the *Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology* against Name No. 225 the Family-Group name MORPHIDAE

- (correction of MORPHITES) Newman, E., 1834 (*Ent. Mag.* vol. 2(4), pp. 379, 381) for the present name MORPHIDAE Westwood, [1851] (and its reference); with type-genus unaltered;
- (2) place on the *Official Index of Rejected and Invalid Family-Group Names in Zoology* the family-group names –
- (a) MORPHITES Newman, E., 1834 (*Ent. Mag.* vol. 2, pp. 379, 381), an incorrect original spelling of MORPHIDAE;
  - (b) MORPHOIDES Agassiz, 1847 (*Nomencl. zool., Index univ.*, 4<sup>o</sup> edn., p. 239, an unjustified emendation of MORPHIDES Boisduval, 1836, itself an incorrect subsequent spelling of MORPHIDAE.

COMMENT ON THE PROPOSED CONSERVATION OF EDWARDSIIDAE  
ANDRES, 1881 (COELENTERATA: ACTINARIA). Z.N.(S.)2261  
(see vol. 36: 175–179)

By R. K. Brooke (*FitzPatrick Institute, University of Cape Town,  
Rondebosch 7700, R.S.A.*) and  
Prof. J.H. Day (*47 Liesbeek Rd., Rosebank 7700, R.S.A.*)

While Dr Williams has made a very good case which we support for the conservation of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, he has given no reasons for his request that the International Commission place the family-group name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881, on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. If the Commission decides to comply with his request to conserve *Edwardsia* as we hope it will, EDWARDSIIDAE is adequately protected unless there is some problem to which Dr Williams has not drawn attention. The Commission should not be asked to do nor should it do anything more than is needed to solve the problem placed before it.

Reply to the Comment of R.K. Brooke & J.H. Day on Z.N.(S.)2261

By R.B. Williams (*2 Carrington Place, Tring, Herts. HP23 5LA*)

Brooke & Day have questioned the need to request the Commission to place the name EDWARDSIIDAE Andres, 1881 on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology. I am not aware of any problem connected with this name beyond that which I have already stated (Williams, 1979).

2. At the time of writing, the two problems of homonymy of the genus name *Edwardsia* and the invalidity of the family name EDWARDSIIDAE remain separate. I accept that if *Edwardsia* Costa, 1834 were to be suppressed in favour of *Edwardsia* de Quatrefages, 1841, then EDWARDSIIDAE would be automatically validated, but if any valid objection were raised to the suppression of *Edwardsia* Costa, the application for conservation of EDWARDSIIDAE and its placing on the Official List would still have to be considered.